



JSW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Haruyoshi ONO et al.**

Group Art Unit: **2828**

Serial No.: **10/614,277**

Examiner: **Tod Thomas Van Roy**

Filed: **July 8, 2003**

Confirmation Number: **7735**

For: **OPTICAL COMMUNICATION MODULE AND WAVELENGTH  
LOCKER MODULE**

Attorney Docket Number: **030824**

Customer Number: **38834**

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

February 23, 2006

Sir:

Applicants respond herein to the Office Action mailed November 23, 2005 with the present request for reconsideration.

Claims 9-18<sup>1</sup> stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Baba et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,229,832. Applicants respectfully disagree that Baba et al. teaches the subject matter recited in claims 9-18, so therefore the rejection cannot be proper.

Applicants' invention relates to generating "setting values" that cause laser light emitted from a laser module to have a predetermined wavelength and to satisfy predetermined temperature and power intensity conditions. Applicants explain in their application's background section that laser modules may be considered defective unnecessarily, because appropriate setting values could not be determined. With the present invention, the yield from a

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the Office Action states on page 3 that claims "9-16" are rejected, the Office Action refers to claims "14-18" on page 5.